

A SOCIALIST COMMENTARY ON COLONIAL AFFAIRS

Venture

JOURNAL OF THE FABIAN COLONIAL BUREAU

VOL. 6 No. II

MARCH, 1955

MONTHLY 6d

Incorporating *Empire*

Comment

WRITING ON THE WALL IN TANGANYIKA

IT will be a pity if the extreme recommendations of the United Nations Visiting Mission to Tanganyika obscure the value of much of its Report.¹ The Mission did the usual brief trip through the Territory, consulting officials, keeping its eyes open, and hearing views from those who chose to submit them. Its members can hardly be blamed if most of the views it heard were those of Africans, and of those Africans just starting on political organisation who are fashionably regarded by administrators as unrepresentative. The Tanganyika African National Union obviously made a great effort to see that its branches as well as headquarters organisation submitted memoranda. The Europeans and Asians, on the whole, did not. This should surely be a warning to the Tanganyika Government. There is no elected representation for any race in the Legislative Council, where equal numbers of unofficials from the three races are to take their seats this year. By comparison with Kenya, the Tanganyika version of parity is an advance for the Africans. This superiority over its next-door neighbour, with the comparative absence of any racial tension, induces a mood of somnolence in Tanganyika. Elections are considered to be unnecessary, even in Dar-es-Salaam; minor as well as senior civil servants are excluded even from membership of political organisations; reasonable statements from the very moderate president of T.A.N.U. are written down contemptuously in the press; important branches of T.A.N.U. are refused registration under the Societies Ordinance and frivolous answers given by the Secretary of State

when the reasons for refusal are sought.² Even European and Asian political organisations are stifled in this atmosphere, while the Africans run to the Visiting Mission to express views to which the Government is unreceptive. When the last Visiting Mission reported, the Africans had had little to say. Political organisation hardly existed, and there was no Mau Mau over the border. Nor had the final decision to impose federation on Central Africa been taken. There has been a psychological change since then. The writing is now on the wall.

The African 'extremists' said very little that we have not been saying for years. They asked for assurances that Tanganyika would not be linked up with Kenya, that it should be recognised for what it is—an African country—and that 'parity' should be a temporary phase. But there is already an illiberal note creeping in. 'We would also like to make it clear,' said the Citizens' Union in an area where there is a land grievance, 'that when the time for self-government comes, it will not be a multi-racial government but a government for the Africans and by the Africans' (page 120). This is an evil attitude, which will develop if the Government gives no reassurance to the Africans. The Mission found that 'the Territory echoes at present... with the expressions "multi-racial society," "multi-racial government" and "partnership," but not with clear definitions of those terms.' It asks for a statement that 'government will represent a society which, integrating all of its permanent elements on the basis of common citizenship and a common electoral roll, must inevitably be primarily African in character' (page 1854). That is surely fair enough—Tanganyika will become a democratic state. Is any British Government prepared to say that it is *not* aiming at a democratic state? We can see no reason at all why this hedging should

¹ Report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in East Africa, 1954. T/1142.

² See reply to Mr. John Hynd, M.P., *Hansard*, 8.12.54, column 958.

go on. The Governor of Northern Rhodesia made an excellent statement on this subject to the African Representative Council on October 12, 1954. It might be repeated in Tanganyika with benefit both to the Government and to the Meru Citizens' Union:—

'It is the stated policy of Her Majesty's Government . . . to develop Northern Rhodesia for the benefit of all the people of whatever race who live in it. Europeans in this country are going to stay in this country. Many of them are already in their second and third generations and those people are as much natives in this country as any African. If Europeans stay in a country those Europeans must share in the government of the country . . . there will never come a time . . . when all members of the Legislature are Africans, unless it be because the Europeans and Africans together have put them there. . . We have African members in our Legislature to-day and there will never come a time . . . when we do not have African members . . . unless it be because at some time in the future the African and the Europeans together do not happen to have put them there.'¹

That statement leaves a number of questions still unanswered, but it is a great improvement on the vague nothings which at present lead many Africans to believe that a handful of Europeans and Asians are to be given permanent political weight out of all proportion to their numbers.

In the rest of its remarks on the political future of the Territory, the Mission was, however, singularly unhelpful. Having expressed the belief that Ruanda-Urundi should be self-governing in 20 to 25 years, it thinks that Tanganyika can arrive there 'much earlier.' There is no analysis of the present state of political organisation, or of educational levels, or of the potential staffing of the civil service, to justify this (or indeed any other) date. The only criterion of judgment is 'reasonable optimism.' This sort of statement merely infuriates European opinion without assisting the Africans in any way to raise their own political effectiveness. The Mission also has 'every hope that the majority community will protect the minorities without the need for . . . constitutional safeguards' (page 202) such as reserved seats, even although it had heard evidence from Africans who objected to multi-racial county councils 'as they feel that the rights given to non-natives entitling them to be known as Tanganyikans are very unfair' (page 35). Yet its main proposal that the three-year life of the 'parity' legislature should be a time for planning constitutional reform, with a substantial African majority on the unofficial side at the end of it, as in Uganda, is reasonable, and should be the basis of future policy.

On the economic side, the Mission has little to propose which is not already known and has not already been discussed in official and unofficial circles here and in Tanganyika. It has obviously (and rightly) been much influenced by the continuance of land trouble amongst the Wameru in the Northern Province. This has by now become almost a text-book case in the mishandling of land problems, with all the ingredients of official high-handedness, African negation, and unhelpful 'assistance' from outside. It is a dangerous tragedy, right on the border of Kenya, which requires re-examination, as has already been suggested in Parliament. But in a Territory in which one per cent. of the land has been alienated, where Africans, Asians and Europeans can buy leases, where the Government is already buying in alienated land for Africans in congested areas and where the Government itself thinks there will be very little more settlement by individual European farmers, the Mission's land proposals appear to be largely unnecessary. It is suggested in some cases that land should 'automatically revert' to Africans as leases fall in, and in others that 'a non-African owner intending to sell land should be required to offer it in the first instance to Africans.' Such suggestions, coupled with an apparent acceptance of the idea that every African group is entitled to a *lebensraum* all round its own tribal lands, and, simultaneously, that individual Africans should have the right to settle anywhere in Tanganyika, would surely make hay of any coherent land policy. It is also in striking contrast with the demand for an integrated society based on a common citizenship. But these views arise from the genuine fear expressed by Africans that their country is to be gradually taken away from them. In the end it must be recognised that there is no future for even existing European and Asian enterprise in Tanganyika unless there is recognition of this fear, and a willingness to allay it by adopting, in both the political and the economic spheres, a policy of building up the strength of the African community, rather than—as seems so often to be the case at present—of concentrating public attention on safeguards for the minority communities. To be fair to the Tanganyika Government, this is already, to a great extent, its policy. It is hardly necessary, for example, to suggest to it that co-operatives should be encouraged! But no people has ever been inspired by bureaucracy. Unless Tanganyika is different from every other colonial territory, it is the young, educated, 'unrepresentative' men who will finally make the running. If the Mission has achieved nothing else, it has revealed the cloud at present no bigger than a man's hand which should be a warning to everybody in Tanganyika.

¹ *Hansard*, October 27, 1954, column 275.

THE COCOS ISLANDS

THE Labour Party did well to fight the Cocos Islands Bill in the House of Commons.¹ It seems innocuous to transfer to the control of a British Dominion a few small islands in the Indian Ocean with a population of 303. The Labour Government, indeed, started the negotiations with Australia. It was left to the Conservatives to conclude an agreement under which the Islanders, while retaining United Kingdom citizenship and acquiring the right to opt for Australian citizenship, are not guaranteed automatic entry to Australia. The Australian Government is prepared only to give 'sympathetic' consideration to individual applications for admission. The fact that many Cocos Islanders prefer to go to Borneo anyway is quite beside the point. The day may come when the White Australia policy excludes one of them who does want to live in Australia, and his citizenship will not automatically save him. Moreover, the Bill is a precedent. Presumably Mr. Chuter Ede had in mind South Africa's claim to the High Commission territories when he said:—

'We may have other Bills of this kind for the transfer of some other place to some other Dominion. An innocent Member will rise and say to the Government Front Bench, "What

precedent have you for this?" The answer will at once be, "The famous Cocos Islands Act, 1955." This miserable little Measure, dealing with 303 people, might quite well be given as a reason for dealing with a couple of million people somewhere else in the Queen's Dominions.'

Although the Tory majority carried the Bill through the Commons, there is still time for the Australian Government to give the assurances asked for, and no future Government can claim bi-partisan support for the precedent.

THE WEST INDIES MOVE

WE have never been more cheered by a colonial newspaper than we were by *Public Opinion*, January 15, 1955, carrying the four-inch deep banner headline PNP WINS!! At long last Jamaica steps into its proper position in the Caribbean with a Socialist Government headed by Norman Manley. Then came the news that the West Indian Governments have agreed to a conference on Caribbean Federation. Only the last stones now need to be put in place and we shall soon have an independent West Indian Dominion in the British Commonwealth. On that day we shall look for some eight-inch headlines ourselves. It will be worth a whole page!

BOUQUET FOR TRANSPORT HOUSE

LAST year was a landmark in the recent history of the Labour Party. For the first time the National Executive presented to Conference a full statement on colonial policy and for the first time a whole session was devoted to the discussion. Now the Party has issued a discussion pamphlet, *Facing Facts in the Colonies*,² which should be read by every Party member. There is much in it also for colonial readers, whether Socialist or not.

To say that this pamphlet should be read is not to imply that it will be understood. Every month as we try in *Venture* to discuss colonial issues, in intelligible terms we are conscious of the almost total impossibility of presenting a clear, simple picture of the complicated and shifting pattern of relationships within the Colonies and between colonial territories and the United Kingdom. Every month we fail. The writer of *Facing Facts in the Colonies* has also failed, even at the level of 'political education officers and discussion group

leaders' at which the pamphlet is aimed. The pamphlet, like the Colonies, is difficult and complicated. It is also interesting, absorbing and instructive. If sufficient party members can be persuaded to work hard at it, it should kill stone dead the facile generalisations, the blanket 'solutions,' which are still current in the Party and appear on every Conference agenda.

People in the Colonies are not 'just like us,' nor are they 'just like' each other. The pamphlet brings out most clearly the differences between territories and peoples, and the differences within territories, which make broad generalisations inapplicable. It asks for recognition of new trends, such as 'the drive of white settlers to establish their own imperial rule' and 'the imperialist expansion of international Communism,' which are creating real issues within the general problem of 'imperialism.' It points out the conflicts of principle which bedevil nearly every colonial controversy. Perhaps the best example of this is its treatment of one of the few issues which has aroused genuine and widespread interest in the Party, the case of Seretse Khama. The Labour Party has promised to reconsider this case when it regains office, bearing in

¹ *Hansard*, 31.1.55 and 7.2.55. See also *Colonial Opinion* on page 8.

² The Labour Party, Transport House, Smith Square, London, S.W.1. 6d.

mind the original five-year limit placed on the banishment, although the Conservative Government has announced that it will be permanent. The pamphlet asks:—

‘Should the decision be taken after consultations with the other people likely to be adversely affected, e.g. the people of the other Protectorates and the Africans in South Africa, or should it be taken solely on principle? In any case, what is the principle involved? Is it that the wishes of the tribe themselves must be binding, that the chieftainship system should be upheld, or simply the principle of racial equality, and the right of individuals to marry according to their choice?’

Or again, in the case of the Kabaka of Buganda, ‘we find many Socialists in the apparently paradoxical position of defending the rights of monarchy.’ Or on British Guiana:—

‘If there was a danger of the new Constitution, which gave adult suffrage but restricted the power of the Executive Council, being subverted by Communist intrigue, had the British Government a duty to step into prevent this? If not, how can we say that we are trying to build democracies so that we are able to leave behind us a free society?’

‘We’ are trying to build democracies—we, the people of the United Kingdom, Socialists included. This will appear to many to be a contradiction in terms. It implies a recognition of a fact that is not known, or passes unnoticed, amongst many Labour Party members—that in certain circumstances and in some territories the imperial power plays a progressive rôle. The traditional picture of millions of politically conscious people striving to throw off the imperialist chains which bind them bears, in many Colonies, no relation to reality. Modern administration, particularly modern social conceptions, may be introduced by the metropolitan power. They may also be positively resented by the recipients. Colonial ‘nationalists’ are not all replicas of Mr. Nehru. Some are closer to Dr. Malan. This is obvious where there is a racial issue. The pamphlet shows that it is sometimes true in another sense:—

‘There is another problem in Uganda which is not so obvious. Amongst the Africans themselves there are different gradations of political, social and economic status. . . Within the Baganda themselves a semi-feudal hierarchy still exists. Unless we are prepared to pass over power to the privileged few and enable them to dominate the masses we have to find the means to promote the spirit and practice of democracy amongst the African community itself. . . Honest administration does not appear out of a vacuum, it has to be consciously built up. Moreover, feudalism can so easily adopt the forms of political democracy (*Northern Nigeria?*) and use them for reactionary purposes, unless the democratic spirit has sunk deeply into the consciousness of the nation itself.’ (*Our italics.*)

The thought comes out again in the references to Liberia, ‘which never had the benefit of any imperial guidance,’ and to Kenya, where it is related to immigrant communities—‘it is still a fact that development would be thrown back a very long way if the Europeans and Asians were suddenly to disappear.’

This is a train of thought which is most unpalatable to many Socialists, but which arises from the most difficult problem now facing Socialists in the colonial field. Self-government is no longer thought to be enough. We do not want a repetition of South Africa or parts of Latin-America. We want the ordinary people to have a chance, which they can have only in a democratic state. Yet the conception of mass democracy which pervaded so much liberal thought in the nineteenth century has not been wholly effective in Europe, and when linked with techniques of plebiscites and party rather than parliamentary control, has proved fatal. It would be surprising indeed if the slogans of 1848 proved adequate for a wide variety of peoples outside Europe in 1955.

This problem will face the Colonial peoples even after power has been transferred. It is a weakness of the pamphlet that it does not specifically say that many colonial problems are not ‘colonial’ at all, but have had to be faced in what are now considered to be ‘developed’ countries. In pointing the problems so ruthlessly for British Socialists, there is a danger that the colonial peoples may come to be regarded as peoples apart, peculiar in their political and economic backwardness. This will emphasise the humanitarian didactic strain in British Socialism, which is good in itself, but which is no longer enough. ‘We in the Labour Party,’ says Mr. Morgan Phillips in his foreword, ‘are specially sensitive to the needs and aspirations of colonial peoples.’ Perhaps we are, but it is not a question only of needs and rights. Do we understand that we are all involved in the task of achieving and maintaining civilised standards, and that success in Europe is as important for the Colonies as their success is to us? Do we see the achievements as well as the aspirations? Do we respect as well as sympathise?

There is some danger in stressing too many unpleasant facts. If the Colonies are presented as the white man’s burden they may once more come to be regarded as millstones round our necks. In fact, they are full of potential, not merely objects of pity. It may be right that we should know that in Britain our average income per head is eight times that of two-thirds of the world’s people and that for over 1,500m. people life is ‘nasty, brutish and short.’ But the worst poverty is not in British Colonies, nor is illiteracy confined to non-self-

governing territories. The state of 'under-developed' countries is a much wider problem than that of colonialism and will not be ended when the last Colony has become free. The peoples of the British Colonies have a lot to contribute to this problem, as any study of UNESCO techniques already shows. Some of them may also widen and enrich our whole conception of Socialism. It is no accident that *Facing Facts in the Colonies* devotes such a very short chapter to Socialist principles and is so uncertain about what they are. In industrialised Britain we have not had to face the problems of peasant agriculture, European Socialists have said and done remarkably little about them, and even the vaunted Soviet successes in this field are now publicly admitted to be failures. For terri-

tories in which peasant farmers predominate, as in most of the Colonies, Socialist principles themselves require reinterpretation, and some of the speeches of West African leaders reveal a consciousness of this fact. We shall find, in the end, that the teaching is not all on our side.

In other words, there is something in this venture for us as well as the peoples of the Colonies. In the final sections dealing with the structure appropriate to a multi-racial Commonwealth, *Facing Facts in the Colonies* comes close to the realisation of a new vision without quite getting there. But the first step is to recognise things as they are before seeing what they might be. This pamphlet enables every Labour Party member to take that step.

COLONIAL POLICY QUESTIONNAIRE

Acting on the suggestion of Mr. Charles Archibald in the November 1954 number of 'Venture,' the Fabian Colonial Bureau has circulated to its colonial members and friends the questionnaire set out below. Copies are available at 11, Dartmouth Street, S.W.1., if more are required, and members who have not yet replied are asked to do so as soon as possible so that extracts from replies may be published in 'Venture.'

1. (a) What, in your opinion, are the main objectives of British colonial policy to-day? To what extent, would you say, are they being realised: (i) generally; (ii) in your territory?
(b) Do you agree to these objectives?
2. (a) Are you an advocate of parliamentary democracy (as practised in the United Kingdom) for dependent territories?
(b) If so, are you prepared to see political and social institutions in your own country abandoned where they conflict with the principles of parliamentary democracy?
3. (a) Do you support the aim of self-government for dependent territories irrespective of internal political and economic conditions and of the size of the communities and territories concerned?
(b) Have you any suggestions on the future of small territories which may become internally self-governing but will always be too small to defend themselves?
(c) Do you want your own country to remain in the Commonwealth after it has attained self-government?
(d) Are you satisfied with present methods of consultation within the Commonwealth?
4. What features of the United Kingdom way of life with respect to industrial organisation and social services would you like to see introduced in your country?
5. (a) If you believe that your territory needs financial assistance for development, do you think it should be given through the agency of (i) the United Nations; (ii) the United Kingdom working in co-operation with colonial governments; (iii) several countries (e.g. the Colombo Plan); (iv) the United States (e.g. the recent agreements on U.S. assistance for British Guiana)?
(b) Would you expect financial assistance to be forthcoming without political control?
6. Do you think that private investment from outside should be encouraged in your territory? If so, what inducements would you offer and what control over it would you expect your government to exercise?
7. Judging by its record in office from 1945-51 and in opposition since 1951, do you think that the Labour Party has followed a policy acceptable and beneficial to colonial peoples?
8. Two Socialist organisations in the Colonies (the Malta Labour Party and the People's National Party of Jamaica) are affiliated to the Socialist International, to which the British Labour Party is also affiliated. The Pan-Malayan Labour Party is a member of the Asian Socialist Conference which is associated with the Socialist International. Both the British Labour Party and the Socialist International maintain informal links with nationalist and other bodies in the Colonies which may not have socialist aims. Do you think that formal organisational links should be established by any party in your own country with (i) the British Labour Party; (ii) the Socialist International?

PARTY PROGRAMMES

THE PROGRESSIVE PARTY (UGANDA)

A new party has been formed in Uganda under the presidency of E. M. K. Mulira. Its first manifesto is given below.

A party working for progress towards the building of a new self-governing Uganda.

Progress towards self-government in Uganda can only be achieved if three things obtain, namely, leadership in self-help, education and economic development of the African. By education is not merely meant schooling, but the wider sense of the word, which the Baganda called 'Okugunjala.' It is the aim of the Progressive Party to give the country these things.

AIMS AND OBJECTS

National

1. To serve our people to serve themselves.
2. To secure political responsibility for the African to guarantee his economic and other freedom.
3. To raise the standard of living of the African by providing for him means of access to knowledge and wealth.
4. To keep the best in African culture and the traditional rights of the African.
5. To raise the status of women.
6. To be the vanguard of action in influencing affairs of national survival (e.g. the return of the Kabaka).
7. To achieve and maintain the independence of Uganda as an African State within the British Commonwealth.

International

1. To ensure that federation with the other East African Territories is absolutely outside the realm of practical politics.
2. To work with other progressive movements in African and other countries with the view to putting to an end imperialism and colonialism and to support all measures for world peace.
3. To safeguard the liberties of all the inhabitants of Uganda.

OUR PHILOSOPHY

Our philosophy is progress through directed self-help. The Progressives aim at giving their country their utmost for the highest improvement of their lot and the lot of the society they live in. The motto, therefore, is 'Action not words.'

All progress is the result of sustained action, either by an individual or by a group. Where people work, and work hard, there is progress; where they idle or simply enjoy life, society is dead. Work, therefore, is the key to progress: Knowledge and wealth.

In man there are two voices: the voice that tells

him to languish, and the voice that urges him to action, to getting on in life by sacrificing easy time and giving his life to doing something worth while. The latter is the voice of progress. In losing his life by giving it away to some useful purpose man finds his true existence and happiness. Knowledge and wealth are never gained except through hard work. Knowledge and wealth coupled with sacrifice are pre-requisites of progress both individual and social.

January, 1955.

PEOPLE'S NATIONAL PARTY (JAMAICA)

The recent elections in Jamaica were won by the P.N.P., which issued a 23-page pamphlet 'Plan for Progress' to explain its policy, some points from which are given below.

The plan is for the first five years of office and envisages development expenditure of £30m. and new investment of £50m. drawn from local and foreign sources of private capital, under the following heads:

1. The establishment of a Ministry of Production and an Economic Advisory Council.
2. Survey of land resources, utilisation of idle lands, permanent settlement of small tenants on their holdings, land settlement schemes with emphasis on co-operative methods, swamp reclamation.
3. Development of irrigation and power resources.
4. 'Where lands are not suited for ordinary cultivation the PNP will carry out schemes for establishing food-bearing trees in the place of the ordinary forestry programmes.'
5. Credit facilities for farmers and fishermen.
6. In regard to agricultural exports, 'our aim will be constantly to represent the need for and to seek to secure guaranteed markets and security of prices under long-term contracts wherever possible.'
7. Extension of agricultural training facilities, a Faculty of Agriculture at the University College of the West Indies, development of the co-operative movement.
8. 'We pledge the fullest support and the maintenance and improvement of all schemes and laws designed to attract foreign capital to Jamaica for investment in local industry. We guarantee to maintain the utmost good faith in our relations with foreign investors and to give them security and protection in all proper ways.'
9. The existing Industrial Development Corporation has worked well within its limits, but suffers from lack of finance and inability to do any research work or to pioneer in industries that private capital is unwilling to deal with. The PNP plans to devote much of the proposed expenditure to the work of the Corporation. Its present working

capital of less than £½m. to be increased to at least £3m.

10. The establishment of a Small Industries Credit Corporation for small craftsmen, with special regard to providing assistance through organised bodies such as co-operatives.
11. The PNP includes in its programme the industrial objectives of the National Workers' Union: vacation leave with pay, sick pay, adequate wages, a 45-hour week, equal pay for women 'when doing work of the same standard and quality as men,' apprenticeship laws, establishment of industrial relations machinery, a fair labour code, overhaul of workers' compensation law and other labour laws, abolition of child labour, decent housing for estate workers. Also, 'there must be workers' representation on bodies operating under public franchise or as public corporations in equal proportion to the other interests represented on such bodies.'
12. Expansion of educational services, including adult education and library services. School meals, as part of a nutrition plan.
13. Within the limits of resources, and as soon as possible, the introduction of Old Age Pensions. Public works of a useful nature to relieve unemployment.
14. The establishment of a National Bank.
15. Reform of local government, including relaxation of excessive control by central Government.
16. Dominion status within five years 'either within a Caribbean Federation or on our own.'
17. Jamaican participation in a Caribbean Federation.

The programme ends with a pledge to support 'the Cause of Democratic Socialism and the Christian way of life,' to oppose Communism and all forms of dictatorship. It says: 'The last ten years have seen a terrible decay in standards of public honesty. It has ranged from cheap and petty dishonesty to monstrous crimes of betrayal of the very foundations of good government. It has included a shameless abuse of power for personal ends. . . It is time to put an end to these things. . .'

MALTA LABOUR PARTY

The following extract is taken from the Malta Labour Party's Electoral Manifesto, 1955, as given in the January number of the Party's monthly review, 'The Knight.'

III. Relations with British Government

Our relations with the British Government have improved to such an extent as to earn us the accusation of 'tools of British Imperialism' by the same sources who only a year ago were branding us 'anti-British agitators.'

We therefore take great pride in quoting in full the keynote of the Labour Manifesto published immediately after the Party's rebirth in August, 1950:—

'At this fateful crossing of the roads we therefore give a positive lead to our nation by advocating two possible alternatives, each of which would make

every son of Malta answer any eventual call for duty by the Mother Country without pangs of conscience and misgivings.

The first is the gradual incorporation of Malta into the political, financial and social institutions of the British Isles. This objective would involve a 20-year plan to turn Malta into an integral part of Great Britain with representatives at Westminster and enough safeguards to keep intact the full rights and privileges of the Roman Catholic Church in these Islands. It presupposes an immediate guarantee of aid to raise the social status of the people of these Islands to heights recorded in Great Britain.

The second implies the recognition of Malta's right to self-determination with the removal of the Reserved Matters and an amicable negotiation of a 20-year Treaty of Friendship regulating the relations between the two countries. The choice of any of these two alternatives rests with the British Government. On our part we shall strive to work through UNO to eradicate discrimination and build a sounder civilisation on racial parity.'

IV. The Home Office Offer

The Home Office Offer of December, 1953, was accepted by the Labour Party as a possible gesture on the part of the British Government to meet us halfway on the basis of our first alternative.

Attempts by the Labour Party to convince Her Majesty's Government to broaden the implications of the offer have been crowned with success. The Secretary of State's invitation to meet and discuss the offer with the leaders of political parties represented in Malta's Parliament was made in response to a suggestion of the Malta Labour Party.

The British Government has therefore given proof of good faith, and we are in honour bound to explore the ways and means of implementing a solution of our own choosing.

An undue emphasis on our national prestige or an over-estimation of the importance of our Islands in the new disposition of Western strategic forces is not our main danger in the immediate future.

It may rather lie in our eagerness to share the benefits of a welfare state without an equal readiness to shoulder the burdens. No lasting agreement with the British Government is possible, even at this late stage, unless it is sustained by goodwill on both sides and by a spontaneous desire to take the rough with the smooth.

V. A New Constitution

The Labour Party, therefore, has already officially submitted the following six points as a *sine qua non* basis for a new Constitution:—

1. Social services and direct taxation for the people of Malta on a basis of absolute parity with residents of Britain.
2. Equality of opportunities and treatment putting an end to the existing wage discriminations.
3. Extension of economic planning and full employment measures to these Islands.
4. Retention of exclusive right by Westminster in all matters affecting foreign relations and defence.
5. Adequate representation of the Maltese people at Westminster.
6. Unfettered local autonomy in all other matters.

VI. Closer Union and History

It is not in the best interest of our people, whose natural growth has been stifled through artificial isolation for many centuries, to magnify unduly the dangers of complete absorption of these Islands by a closer political and economic union with Great Britain. Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland did not lose their identity and characteristics. Our history records an almost identical association with Rome in the heydays of the Roman Empire without any adverse effects on our national identity and traditions. On

the contrary, the very elements among us who to-day shriek loudest against this imaginary pitfall were most vociferous yesterday in acclaiming this period of our history as most glorious.

Unless we wish to be remembered by posterity as a rare museum specimen, extinct and incapable of reproduction, we must take a realistic cognizance of the vast regroupings taking shape around us—regroupings of former proud, self-sufficient units, reluctantly combining into a larger conglomeration with palpable losses to erstwhile paramount sovereignties.

COLONIAL OPINION . . .

End of an Idyll

'Such scraps of information as come out of the Cocos suggest moreover that the islanders themselves have no particular reason to be pleased. Development of the air strip and its use by commercial aircraft has not brought new prosperity. There are a few menial jobs, but Australian trade union rules were not meant to accommodate Cocos islanders. The islanders' own way of life, first threatened by over-population, has now been menaced by the cutting down of many of the coconut trees. Everything is subordinate to the air strip and air safety. . .

It may seem a very small matter. The whole population of the islands is now no more than a few hundred. They have been encouraged to leave, and those who have done so apparently are winning for themselves a somewhat better living in North Borneo. Probably it is better that still more of them should leave the Cocos, for the idyllic life their fathers knew has vanished. Fish, coconuts and copra, and a paternal "king"—all are gone or are going in the wind of giant Constellation. The Cocos islands are becoming important for the first time since Captain Keeling sighted them in 1609, and it is an importance which persuades its inhabitants to leave. But a principle is at stake. The change was decided without the knowledge of the islander, and without even the pretence of consultation. Britain, Australia and Singapore may be right in their assumption that they know what is best, and it is certainly much to everyone's convenience to treat the islanders as voiceless tokens. But this adds to the responsibility of ensuring that what is done is indeed for the best, and assurance at the moment is missing.'

Straits Times, Singapore, January 11, 1955.

Party and People

'To-day, the new House of Representatives under the revised constitution meets for the first time. This day, therefore, marks a great landmark in the constitutional development of Nigeria. . .

We feel, however, that some words of advice on this august occasion will not be out of place. It is true that what we have to-day is a party government. But it is equally true that as a government, it exists

only for the people of Nigeria, not for the parties of which it is composed. With the government, once it assumes responsibility, it is the interest of the people, high and low, that must be supreme.

From to-day onwards, we hope the government will ensure that party consideration yields place to the good of the people. That is the supreme test—the test of honesty and sincerity of purpose in all that we have been telling the Nigerian electorate in season and out of season. . .

Daily Service, January 12, 1955.

Ashanti's Stand

'In her demand for a federal form of government Ashanti has posed several momentous questions. So far, not even one of these has been satisfactorily answered. All that the CPP has been able to do is to run riot—from the top of its mighty pyramid down.

From the very top of the CPP pyramid Ashanti has been charged with being an enemy of the people of this country, and her legitimate demand condemned as coming from a clique of an irresponsible minority.

From the very top of the CPP pyramid Ashanti has been charged with trying to break the essential unity of the country and thus to delay self-government.

To demonstrate her seriousness of purpose, however, the Asanteman Council sent a petition to the Queen through the Secretary of State for the Colonies praying that Her Majesty do appoint a Royal Commission to investigate Ashanti's demand.

The reply of the Secretary of State is now well known. To all intelligent people it should tend to change the outlook of the CPP to Ashanti's demand considerably. The Secretary of State has noted Ashanti's demand, but has directed that discussions should take place internally, that is, without any outside agency.

It is in our opinion pertinent, at this stage, to recapitulate Ashanti's stand in the matter.

The kernel of Ashanti's demand is genuine fear of a communist and fascist dictatorship in which all her time-honoured traditions and customary practices would be steam-rolled.

In its memorandum to the Asanteman Council dated October 19, 1954, copy of which was attached to the Asanteman Council's petition to Her Majesty

the Queen, the National Liberation Movement noted among other things:

"The 'hush-hush' attitude of the Government to the farmers' reaction to the Cocoa Duty and Development Fund Ordinance is only one out of many instances of dictatorial tendencies of the present Government, which, if not checked, will drive the new and sovereign Gold Coast into a Communist State. . . We in Ashanti have felt particularly perturbed by the passing of the Cocoa Duty and Development Fund Ordinance since we consider that it affects us as a group more than any other community in the country; but we consider that the cocoa issue is only one facet of a larger problem the solution of which calls for the united action of all citizens of the Gold Coast and the Trans-Volta Territories who wish to see and live not only in a self-governing Gold Coast but in a country in which moral values and fair play are respected. We firmly believe that no solutions have any chance of permanence without some form of a federal constitution for the government of the country, and we could never compromise on this."

What answer has the CPP Government so far given to this?

Ashanti Pioneer (Kumasi), January 17, 1955.

Gold Coast Democracy

'Not a day passes, but we are confirmed in our belief, that a great conspiracy has taken shape in this country. It is a conspiracy not only against the Convention People's Party and the progressive Government for that matter, but also, as should be clearly understood, against every one of the four and a half million people of this country—indeed, all Africa.

Spear-heading this counter-revolutionary conspiracy is the same old God-forsaken traducers and detractors of our cause who have borne an eternal grudge against CPP for introducing in this country a Democratic System of Government whereby the interests of the vast majority of people take precedence over the selfish ends of a mealy-mouthed winning minority whose sole ambition in life is profit for profit sake, autocratic over-lordism over the farmers and common people, and boastful arrogance which claims for itself the divine right of King John.

But we have said again and again that it is the CPP's socialism that made the Common People of this country realise their degradation, the apathy, squalor, neglect and suffering to which they were condemned in the days when only a few autocratic chiefs held sway. It is Socialism which aroused the masses to constitutional action to break their chains. Socialism built CPP. Socialism shall still maintain it from the capitalist hounds and reactionary aristocratic wolves that seek Ghana's ruin. Socialism hates and abhors the grinning autocracy of a clique of privileged minority bourgeois elements and thus seeks to democratise our culture and adjust our social structure in a way so equitable as not to bring the institution of chieftaincy into perpetual conflict with the democratic attitudes of the new Society. Is this not an honest and sincere way to preserve chieftaincy? Why then should responsible persons try to disgrace themselves

by joining the unholy conspiracy against Ghana's freedom? Why? . . .'

Evening News (Accra), January 21, 1955.

Dual Nationality

'When Mr. Chou En-lai was in Delhi, he promised Mr. Nehru that Communist China would no longer claim the loyalty of Chinese overseas. It would not question the right of Chinese domiciled overseas to take up the nationality of the country of their adoption, and it would forbid those who elected to remain Chinese to engage in politics. There was no trace of this promise in the new constitution approved by acclamation in Peking in October. But from Peking, a correspondent of the *Times of India* reports that China and Indonesia have agreed "in principle" to end dual nationality. Negotiations are still in progress concerning implementation of the agreement. If the principle is accepted, the details are a trifle. . .

An even more interesting question is whether Peking intends to restrict its decision on the allegiance of Chinese living overseas to those countries with whose governments it chooses to enter into special agreement. If so, some painful deductions will have to be drawn. But if not, then why this treaty with Indonesia? All that is needed is the amendment to the constitution which Mr. Nehru anticipated in the first place. There would be no problem at all if Peking simply said that Chinese who desire to become nationals of the country in which they are domiciled may do so, while the rest remain Chinese, barred like all aliens from political activity.'

Straits Times (Singapore), December 3, 1954.

THE FUTURE OF MALTA, G.C.

Lord Faringdon, who recently visited Malta, spoke to a meeting of the Fabian Colonial Bureau on February 9th. Some points in his speech are given below:

Malta is now preparing for a general election, in which the Labour Party, led by Dom Mintoff, hopes to win a majority of seats. In the past, relations with Italy used to be the dominant issue, but although some of the older people still speak Italian and some of them completed their education in Italy, this is no longer an issue in Maltese politics. The election has intensified and widened discussion of a most interesting proposition which has been put before the Maltese and will be presented to the British people: that Malta should be integrated with the United Kingdom. So far, the British Government has offered to place the affairs of Malta under the Home Office, but the implications of this offer are not clear and it has not been accepted by the Malta Labour Party.

To Malta's geography is due her past history and

(Continued on page 12)

Parliament

Peking statement on Overseas Chinese. Mr. Sorensen asked in view of the content of the official statement of the Chairman of Chinese Overseas Affairs on January 3, what representations had been made by Her Majesty's Government to the Chinese Government to use its influence on Chinese Communists in Malaya to bring to an end their terrorist activities. Mr. Turton said that Her Majesty's Government had made no representations to the Chinese Government on the lines suggested. They had, however, noted that in the statement Madame Ho Hsiang-ning, Director of the Commission of Overseas Affairs of the Government of the People's Republic of China, said that it was the duty of the Chinese Communists overseas not to take part in political disputes in their countries of residence, and to obey and observe the local laws and customs. (January 28.)

United Kingdom contribution to United Nations. In reply to Mr. Younger, Mr. Turton said that the total contribution to the United Nations, the Specialised Agencies and the extra-Budgetary funds for 1954 was approximately £10,340,000. No other Government, except the United States of America, contributed so much. (February 7.)

Extra-Mural Studies in Kenya and Tanganyika. Mr. Rankin asked whether the Governments of Kenya and Tanganyika had now studied the work of the Extra-Mural Department of the University College of East Africa; and what action were they prepared to take in their own territories. Mr. Lennox-Boyd replied that he now understood that the Kenya Government was considering the provision of funds; the Governor of Tanganyika was doubtful whether the establishment of extra-mural work in that territory was immediately practicable, but similar activities were being undertaken by other bodies. (February 2.)

Immigration into the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland. In reply to Mr. Dugdale, Mr. Dodds-Parker said he was willing at any time to discuss with the Federal Government any aspect of immigration, if they so wished. Mr. Dugdale said that there was grave disquiet at the increasing South African immigration into these territories, and asked whether, in view of the effect that this might have on the native inhabitants of Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland, for whom the United Kingdom Government was responsible, he would consult with the Federation Government as to what steps could be taken to prevent this. Mr. Dodds-Parker replied that immigration into the Federation was entirely a matter for the Government of the Federation, as was decided by Parliament. (January 27.)

Colonial students in the United Kingdom. In reply to Mr. P. Williams, Mr. Lennox-Boyd said that it was estimated that at least 2,120 colonial students arrived during 1954 from the following territories: Nigeria,

670; Gold Coast, 175; Sierra Leone and Gambia, 100; Kenya, 100; Uganda, 75; Tanganyika and Zanzibar, 30; Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland, 10; Aden and Somaliland, 25; Hong Kong, 145; Malaya and Singapore, 210; Sarawak and Borneo, 28; Cyprus, 20; Malta, 5; Gibraltar, 10; Mauritius and Seychelles, 35; St. Helena, 1; Bahamas, 8; Barbados, 60; Bermuda, 7; British Guiana, 75; British Honduras, 3; Jamaica, 150; Leeward Islands, 23; Trinidad, 110; Windward Islands, 45. The main subjects of study were accountancy, agriculture, arts, architecture, dentistry, domestic science, engineering, forestry, law, local government, medicine, music, nursing, printing, science, secretarial and teacher training. (February 9.)

Constitutional proposals for Nyasaland. In reply to Mr. James Johnson, Mr. Lennox-Boyd said that the Governor was that day convening a conference of African, Asian and European representatives to discuss with them proposals for the revision of the constitution. These proposals would increase the total membership of Legislative Council from 21 to 23; the present provision for one nominated European member to represent African interests and for one nominated Asian member would be deleted; one official member would be added, making 12 in all including the Governor, and there would be six non-African unofficials and five African unofficials. The proposals also provided for the election of non-African members of Legislative Council on a non-African electoral roll by constituencies. No changes were proposed in the method of selection of African unofficial members of Legislative Council or in the composition of Executive Council. The recommendations and comments of the conference convened by the Governor would be submitted to the Secretary of State for the Colonies in due course. (February 9.)

Matriculation students in N. Rhodesia and Nyasaland. Mr. James Johnson asked what would be the approximate numbers of African pupils taking the matriculation certificate or its equivalent in 1955 and 1956. Mr. Lennox-Boyd replied that the matriculation standard for the University College of Rhodesia and Nyasaland would be passes in a certain number of subjects of the Cambridge School Certificate or the Higher Certificate, taken at the appropriate levels. In 1955, there would be 70 African candidates for the School Certificate from Northern Rhodesia and 38 from Nyasaland. In 1956, the numbers would be 74 and 49, and in addition there would probably be eight candidates for the Higher Certificate from Northern Rhodesia and five from Nyasaland. (February 9.)

Registered Electors in Singapore and Malaya. In reply to Mr. Sorensen, Mr. Lennox-Boyd said that there were about 1,280,000 registered electors in the Federation of Malaya, and 299,850 in Singapore. No analysis of the figures by race was available. (February 9.)

Guide to Books

Must We Lose Africa?

By Colin Legum. (W. H. Allen, 16s.)

The present discontents of Africa are symptomatic of the most dynamic force which has hit the world since the French Revolution—the force of twentieth century nationalism. That African nationalism should have come to grips with British colonialism was inevitable, for a number of reasons. The British cultivated the germ with education and promises of self-government. At the same time they kept the pace of political progress slow. And having themselves been inoculated against the nationalist disease long ago, they do not easily sympathise with those who have it in an acute form.

Colin Legum writes of the conflicts and dangers arising from this situation, with special reference to the recent months of crisis in Uganda, the theme of the first 13 chapters of his book. These make a masterly piece of reporting. People who live in Africa often get tired of journalists who air their opinions in print after the briefest of stays in the country. But here is no airing of opinions. Instead, we find a factual and objective description of the events which led up to the Kabaka's banishment, and a quite remarkable knowledge and understanding of the people of Buganda and their history. The author describes the background to the banishment—the nature of the Kabaka-ship, the life story of the present Kabaka, the modern history of Buganda and of Uganda as a whole. It is a story of the development of British colonial government on the one hand, and of the growth of African national awareness on the other, until the two meet and conflict in the persons of Sir Andrew Cohen and Kabaka Frederick Mutesa. One is left with three main impressions: of the apparently inevitable clash between British concepts of democracy, economic efficiency and political structure on the one hand, and African nationalism, tinged with reaction, on the other; of the gravity of the psychological wound inflicted on the Baganda by the Kabaka's banishment; and of the Kabaka himself, who moves through these pages, a significant and tragic figure.

In Part Two, Colin Legum widens his field from Uganda to the whole continent. He considers the relationship between the West and Africa, and reviews the problems of European and of Asian settlement, of the ferment of western ideas in Africa, of the Christian churches there, and of a number of kindred matters. Finally, he sketches a 'Basis of Policy' in three chapters entitled 'Political', 'Influence and Manpower' and 'Economic.' But the heart of the whole matter seems to be summarised in these extracts from two separate chapters:—

'The prime contention of those who are opposed to rapid political development in Africa is usually that "political development must not outpace economic development." This view wins ready acceptance. But it is a dangerous argument because while

propounding an obvious truth it distorts perspective by ignoring practical realities.' (Page 147.)

'... Only when the African leaders feel secure in their political control will they actively encourage industrial development which is largely dependent on foreign capital and technicians.' (Page 202.)

These extracts typify the good sense and deep insight which are characteristic of the whole book. Colin Legum's fair presentation of the problems of modern Africa is excellent, and everyone who is in any way interested in Africa should read this book.

Valentine Elliott.

Niger Dawn

By Frances M. Hensley. (Stockwell, 4s.)

This is a wonderful book. It is not well written in a stylistic sense and its thought is not profound, but it carries the reader enthralled to the end and amazed at the courage and endurance of the author. Mrs. Hensley went to Nigeria in 1897 as one of a party of C.M.S. missionaries led by her brother, Tom Dennis, translator of the Bible into Ibo, after whom the Dennis Memorial Grammar School at Onitsha is named. Stationed first at Onitsha, she went on the first itineration to Awka, walking by moonlight and wading the streams; she was the first white woman to arrive in Agbor, seven years after the Benin massacre, and found the nails (and a skull) still in place on the crucifixion tree; in 1907 she walked and was carried in a hammock from Owerri to Ngwana and by launch to Arochuku, where the Long Juju had been destroyed. Her comment on this journey epitomises the spirit of the book:—

'We had had a vision of the vastness of the Ibo country and its needs. We were certainly [at Owerri] in the centre of this great race. Onitsha was at one gateway and Arochuku at another; but there was no doubt that at last we had been brought right inside: the dream was about to be fulfilled of those great souls who had prayed and laboured and had passed without seeing the Light chasing the darkness away with the lovely rays from the Sun of Righteousness Who had arisen with healing in His wings.'

Frances Dennis worked with her medicines in the light of this faith, and what she saw around her of local custom—the girls with no choice in marriage, the *osu* dedicated to the stream, the annual sacrifice when the king of Onitsha left his compound, the 'bad bush' where twin babies were left to die, the 'mo' with the mask and the whips—confirmed her belief that Christianity was a liberating faith. In this day, one would like to know more of what *exactly* was taught. From her account, it seems to have been a very unsophisticated form of evangelism:

'The Ibos are a very religious people, and I think do not separate the spiritual and physical as we do. Every part of their life as pagans touches spiritual power outside and beyond themselves. . . They had never lost their natural belief in God—a very real belief—and in speaking to these crowds listening for the first time to the Gospel, it was great to build up

the message upon the foundation of the One God, ours and theirs. . . . Another wonderful help was their understanding of sacrifice—a life given up to death in place of their own life. The highest sacrifice they were able to share in was the life of a slave. . . . The Evangelists . . . told of the Sacrifice of God's beloved Son with such power that it became real to the minds of the listeners, and we were thrilled as we watched the amazed expressions on their faces. . . .

What the Ibos thought of the 'glorious message' is plain to see in the large number of Christians to-day and in the foreword by Bishop Onyeabo, the second Ibo to enter the Ministry. But one would like to know more in a detailed sense, particularly of those first converts, including the sick witch doctor to whom Miss Dennis administered quinine and Epsom salts and who came back a year later to be taught and baptised.

But the outstanding impression is of the mark this handful of people left on the land. So deep was it that 44 years after Mrs. Hensley left Nigeria, when the Nigerian constitutional conference was held in London, one of the delegates went to see her. He had lived for seven years in her household as a boy, and went out of Nigeria for the first time in 1953 as a man of 58. When he left, the older people crowded round to send their greetings to 'Mai' (mother), and his first words on meeting her again were, 'I owe everything to you, my mother in Christ.' If the Labour movement could put 20 people into Africa of Mrs. Hensley's calibre, then we should begin to get somewhere.

Marjorie Nicholson.

South-East Asia Between Two Worlds, by Tibor Mende. (Turnstile Press. Ltd., 21s.) An account of a journey through Indonesia, Burma and Pakistan, the theme of which is the possibility of the power vacuum in South-east Asia, left by the withdrawal of imperial controls, being filled by the creation of strong states in the newly independent countries. The picture drawn is not an encouraging one. The analysis and narrative are interesting but rather superficial, and some protest should surely be recorded against the appalling bad taste of Mr. Mende in his interrogation of perfect strangers—in one case he actually offered money to some Indonesian villagers, thanking them for their patience and hospitality!

(Continued from page 9)

her political future. Malta has no hope of being able to support its present population. Even much of its soil has been imported. Some attempt has been made to develop light industry, and Malta has a brewery which has built up an export trade, but the main employment on the Island is found in the naval dockyard. At present a large number of Maltese are emigrating each month to Australia. Dom Mintoff is very anxious to improve technical education, so that the emigrants may go as skilled men.

At present there is a subsidy from the United Kingdom to Malta, but in practice the Maltese cannot make satisfactory plans as they never know what will be passed by the Treasury. Mr. Attlee, when in office, said that the United Kingdom would make good the costs of administration in Malta. What is administration? Would, for example, a national health service be regarded as a legitimate item for expenditure? In the present circumstances the Maltese need a formula to enable them to plan without constant reference to an outside body.

The proposal for integration has not been thoroughly worked out and should now be carefully examined, both here and in Malta. The whole structure of the British Empire is derived from the days when it took six weeks to cross the Atlantic and this could only be done in six months of the year. With air travel, Malta is not now appreciably farther away from London than Edinburgh or Ulster, and much more accessible than parts of the Highlands and Islands. Its population of about 300,000 would entitle it to two or three Members in the House of Commons, and it is unlikely that the Maltese group would be drawn entirely from one party. Such a group would be too small to exercise the influence that the Irish group used to have. The Labour Party has a programme of local reform, but the proposal for integration with the United Kingdom is its main plank. The idea has been thoroughly sold to the Malta Labour Party members, and if as expected the Party wins the election, it will have to be seriously considered by Whitehall.

Lord Faringdon concluded by saying that he believed the people of Britain would welcome the Maltese, of whom many have happy memories and for whose courage during the war all have a deep admiration.

CONTENTS OF THIS NUMBER

For Reference *March, 1955*

Comment

Writing on the Wall in Tanganyika - - -	1
The Cocos Islands - - -	3
The West Indies Move - - -	3
Bouquet for Transport House - - -	3
Colonial Policy Questionnaire - - -	5

Fact

Party Programmes - - -	6
Colonial Opinion - - -	8
Parliament - - -	10
Guide to Books - - -	11

FABIAN COLONIAL BUREAU

11 Dartmouth Street, London, SW1

Annual Subscription to Bureau . . 20s.
(including *Venture*)

Full-time Students' Subscription . . 10s.

Annual Subscription to *Venture* only 7 6d.

Further details of membership from the Secretary